R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 014 526 UD 004 789

AN ANALYSIS OF THE EVALUATION OF THE MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM CONDUCTED BY THE CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION.

BY- SCHWAGER, SIDNEY
UNITED FEDERATION OF TEACHERS, NEW YORK, N.Y.

PUB DATE 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.96 22P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS, *EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS, *EVALUATION, TEST RELIABILITY, DATA ANALYSIS, *ACHIEVEMENT GAINS, *COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, READING ACHIEVEMENT, ARITHMETIC, TABLES (DATA), PUBLIC SCHOOLS, MEASUREMENT TECHNIQUES, METHODOLOGY, TEACHING TECHNIQUES, CONTROL GROUPS, OBSERVATION, RELIABILITY, MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS, NEW YORK CITY, CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION, SPECIAL SERVICE SCHOOLS

IN THIS REPORT THE UNITED FEDERATION OF TEACHERS (UFT) ANALYZES SPECIFIC DATA FROM THE CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION'S (CUE) NEGATIVE EVALUATION OF NEW YORK CITY'S MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS (MES) PROGRAM AND CHARGES THAT CUE'S CONCLUSIONS ARE INVALID. THE UFT MAINTAINS THAT SINCE 18 OF THE 21 MES WERE FORMER SPECIAL SERVICE (SS) SCHOOLS, CUE SHOULD HAVE USED SS SCHOOL NORMS AS A BASIS OF EVALUATION RATHER THAN STANDARDIZED NATIONAL GROUP NORMS. MOREOVER, CUE INCONSISTENTLY AND UNSCIENTIFICALLY MATCHED 21 MES WITH ONLY EIGHT CONTROL SCHOOLS, AND COMPARED MES STUDENTS WITH STUDENTS IN OPEN-ENROLLMENT SCHOOLS, A HIGHLY MOTIVATED SCHOOL POPULATION. IN ASSESSING THE READING ACHIEVEMENT OF MES STUDENTS AS COMPARED WITH THAT OF CONTROL STUDENTS, CUE USED INVALID TESTS AND IGNORED AVAILABLE READING SCORES WHICH SHOWED THAT THE NON-MES SS STUDENTS HAD GAINED LITTLE IN READING ACHIEVEMENT. UFT FEELS THAT THE READING ACCOMPLISHMENT OF MES STUDENTS CAN BE WITNESSED BY AN ACHIEVEMENT CLOSE TO NATIONAL NORMS IN GRADES FOUR TO SIX. ALSO, IN ARITHMETIC SIXTH-GRADE MES STUDENTS ARE ONLY ONE YEAR BELOW GRADE LEVEL WHEREAS NON-MES SS STUDENTS ARE TWO YEARS BELOW. SINCE MES CHILDREN ENTERED THE PROGRAM WITH A SEVERE EDUCATIONAL RETARDATION, THESE GAINS SHOW GREAT PROGRESS. MOREOVER THE LONGER A STUDENT IS IN AN MES PROGRAM, THE BETTER HIS ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT. OTHER ASPECTS OF THE CUE REPORT WHICH THE UFT REFUTES INCLUDE EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING TECHNIQUES (PARTICULARLY UFT'S LESSON OBSERVATION CRITERIA), TEACHER AND STUDENT ATTITUDES, SCHOOL CLIMATE, THE EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAM, AND SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS. AMONG OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS, UFT SUGGESTS THAT THE BOARD OF EDUCATION INVESTIGATE IN WHICH SCHOOLS THE MES CONCEPT HAS BEEN MOST EFFECTIVELY IMPLEMENTED. (LB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED014526

AN ANALYSIS OF THE EVALUATION OF THE MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM CONDUCTED BY THE CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

by

Sidney Schwager, Chairman
UFT More Effective Schools Committee

UD004789

AN ANALYSIS OF THE EVALUATION OF THE MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM CONDUCTED BY THE CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

by

Sidney Schwager, Chairman
UFT More Effective Schools Committee

UNITED Federation of Teachers
LOCAL 2 · AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS, AFL-CIO
Affiliated with New York State AFL-CIO, New York City Central Labor Council, Empire State Federation of Teachers

300 Park Avenue South
New York, N. Y. 10010
SPring 7-7500
357

Dear Colleague:

New York City's More Effective Schools Program, which has only had a short lifetime of three years, has been the subject of extravagant praise and condemnation. It is considered by many educators to be the best program of total quality education existing in any urban center and is being copied in other cities throughout the nation. It has also been vilified for producing no improvement in learning while costing a great deal of money.

During the recent contract negotiations between the Board of Education and the UFT, the expansion of M.E.S. was a key issue. The Board contended that an evaluation carried out by the Center for Urban Education proved that M.E.S. was not achieving results. They supported their position by releasing a summary of the report's conclusions during the summer while negotiations were going on. It was impossible for the UFT to answer the charges since the entire study was not available, hence the basis for the conclusions could not be analyzed.

The complete study, entitled "Expansion of the More Effective Schools Program" dated September, 1967, was made available on October 9, 1967. The Board of Education issued the report accompanied by a press release supporting the position that children in More Effective Schools had not improved in reading and arithmetic, and that this failure was based on the lack of innovation in restructuring of the teaching going on in More Effective Schools.

After careful consideration of the entire study, the United Federation of Teachers makes the following charges:

1. The conclusions drawn are invalid since they are not supported by the facts.

2. Compared to children in other Special Service schools, those in M.E.S. are definitely doing better academic work.

3. The Board of Education is responsible for misleading the public through its issuance of a summary report which could not be refuted.

4. Both the Board and the Center for Urban Education have acted irresponsibly by their issuance and support of an evaluation of M.E.S. which clearly contains enough distortions, incomplete information, errors in data collection and illogical conclusions to completely invalidate it.

The following analysis will indicate the basis for our attack on the C.U.E. evaluation, as well as our charge that the Board of Education has consistently refused to support the program and has, in fact, taken steps to destroy it.

Sincerely,

Sidney Schwager

SIDNEY SCHWAGER, Chairman
UFT More Effective Schools Committee

opeiu:153
SS:mm
11/14/67

AN ANALYSIS OF THE EVALUATION OF THE MORE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM CONDUCTED BY THE CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

by

Sidney Schwager, Chairman
UFT More Effective Schools Committee

> "This evaluation belongs to the family of short-time evaluations conducted in the early years of a new program. Such evaluations cannot be considered definitive studies of a program's worth..." (3, 120)*

This statement, twice repeated in the study, is extremely important. The UFT believes and will attempt to prove that the children in the More Effective Schools are showing progress. We recognize, however, that the program is too new to be evaluated in a definitive manner. We are issuing this report because we are convinced that the Board of Education is attempting to destroy M.E.S. The Board and the communications media have accepted the conclusions in the C.U.E. report as final. Unless those conclusions are shown to be wrong, the Board of Education will use them as the basis for phasing out M.E.S.

The observers involved in the C.U.E. study would oppose this destruction of M.E.S. The report states: "All recommended that M.E.S. be continued, although most wanted slight or considerable modifications." (82) We are not told how many wanted "slight" and how many wanted "considerable" modifications. The UFT agrees that changes in the program are necessary, and we have submitted many recommendations aimed at its improvement. The Board of Education has, however, refused to follow any of them. They have, in fact, illustrated their desire to destroy the More Effective Schools by taking two positions from each school and by completely eliminating any centralized administration without which there is the real likelihood of 21 different programs rather than one More Effective Schools Program.

An experimental program of the scope of M.E.S. must have a distinctive point of view. This is especially true because of the great emphasis needed in areas of heterogeneous grouping, teacher training and parent involvement. An office and staff assigned to implement these special needs are vital. While M.E.S. is forced to function without direction, lesser programs which cannot possibly affect children's learning to the degree that M.E.S. can and does are allowed to maintain administrative staffs. The refusal of the Board to follow the same policy for M.E.S. is contrary to its own procedures and can only be considered to be a deliberate act aimed at the elimination of M.E.S.

*( ) Numbers in parentheses refer to pages of C.U.E. evaluation, September, 1967.

TECHNIQUES FOR MEASURING ACADEMIC GROWTH

Use of Urban Norms

We are told that "In the areas of achievement in arithmetic and reading, we used as bases of comparison the norms for urban schools provided by the publisher." (28) These urban norms are 1 to 2 months below national norms and are more representative of large urban centers according to the report.

1. The "urban norms" which are used are referred to by the test publisher as "total group norms" rather than "urban norms." The norms were standardized on a cross section of the population of school systems in 48 states. None of the standardization was conducted in any large urban area in the entire nation.

2. In a lecture dealing with testing the disadvantaged child, Dr. Roger Lennon, Director of Testing for Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., the company which publishes the tests used in the study said: "If there is either serious, notable, significant deprivation for one examinee relative to another, or marked difference in motiviation from one examinee to another, it is impossible to interpret the performance of these two examinees in the same fashion." (A) Most educators strongly agree with this statement. The only norms that should be used to compare M.E.S. are norms for New York City's Special Service schools. Had these norms been developed and used, M.E.S. would be clearly ahead.

Use of Control Schools

The study states: "Achievement was also compared in the matched control and M.E. Schools." (28)

1. There is no attempt by C.U.E. to consistently match achievement in M.E.S. with achievement in control schools. In the section dealing with arithmetic and reading achievement, there are ten tables of statistics. Only two of the ten tables include comparisons with the control schools, and these two tables indicate that M.E. Schools are doing better than control schools. (52,54) One of the two tables follows (Table 10). The other is Table Number 11 which is included to illustrate the next point.

A study which does not provide a clear comparison with a control group cannot be accepted as scientifically valid by any careful observer.

(A) "Testing the Culturally Disadvantaged Child," Roger T. Lennon, Ph. D., Director, Test Department, Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., February 26, 1964. Lecture on Problems in Education, Boston Schools Committee.

Table 10

Median Reading Grade Equivalents October 1966 and April 1967, and Gains During 1966-67 School Year, Old and New MES and Control Schools, by Grade

Grade	Type of School	Median Reading Grade October 1966	Median Reading Grade April 1967	Gain
2	Old MES	1.8	2.6	.8
	New MES	1.8	2.6	.8
	All MES	1.8	2.6	.8
	All Control	1.7	2.3	.6
3	Old MES	2.5	3.5	1.0
	New MES	2.4	3.4	1.0
	All MES	2.4	3.4	1.0
	All Control	2.4	3.2	.8
4	Old MES	3.3	3.9	.6
	New MES	3.2	4.0	.8
	All MES	3.3	3.9	.6
	All Control	3.2	3.7	.5
5	Old MES	3.8	4.5	.7
	New MES	3.7	4.6	.9
	All MES	3.7	4.6	.9
	All Control	3.8	4.3	.5
6	Old MES	5.1	5.5	.4
	New MES	4.6	5.5	.9
	All MES	4.9	5.5	.6
	All Control	5.0	5.5	.5

2. In all but one case where M.E.S. and control schools are compared, the comparison is between the 21 M.E. Schools as a group and the 8 control schools as a group. To obtain a control group, a set of 8 schools was "selected because of their similarity to an M.E. School in terms of location and pupil population." (1) Scientific method would demand that any group comparisons therefore be made between the 8 control schools and their 8 matched schools. Where this more exact and valid procedure was used, it showed the M.E. Schools scoring consistently higher than control schools. (54) Table 11, following, illustrates this point.

Table 11

Comparison of Gains in Median Grade Equivalents in ME and Control Schools by Grade, October 1966 to April 1967.

		Grade											
		2			3			4			5		
Pair	School Type	Oct.	April	Gain	Oct.	April	Gain	Oct.	April	Gain	Oct.	April	Gain
A	MES	1.7	2.4	.7	2.7	3.5	.8	3.4	4.0	.6	3.7	4.1	.4
	C	1.7	2.4	.7	2.4	3.1	.7	3.3	3.7	.4	3.4	3.9	.5
B	MES	2.3	2.9	.6	2.8	3.6	.8	3.9	4.9	1.0	5.0	5.8	.8
	C	1.8	2.5	.7	2.6	3.7	1.1	3.6	4.4	.8	4.6	5.1	.5
C	MES	1.7	2.3	.6	2.3	3.2	.9	3.1	3.3	.2	3.5	4.4	.9
	C	1.7	2.2	.5	2.3	3.0	.7	2.8	3.3	.5	3.4	4.0	.6
D	MES	1.7	2.6	.9	2.4	3.3	.9	3.2	3.8	.6	3.7	4.5	.8
	C	1.7	2.4	.7	2.3	3.1	.8	3.2	3.6	.4	4.0	4.1	.1
E	MES	1.9	2.8	.9	2.9	3.6	.7	3.3	4.2	.9	4.0	4.9	.9
	C	1.9	2.8	.9	2.4	3.5	1.1	3.6	4.2	.6	4.2	4.7	.5
F	MES	1.8	3.2	1.4	2.3	4.3	2.0	3.1	3.8	.7	3.5	4.9	1.4
	C	1.6	2.3	.7	2.4	3.2	.8	3.2	3.8	.6	3.5	4.3	.8
G	MES	1.6	2.3	.7	2.1	3.0	.9	3.1	3.9	.8	4.2	4.4	.2
	C	1.5	2.1	.6	2.2	3.0	.8	3.0	3.3	.3	3.3	4.0	.7
H	MES	2.0	2.8	.8	2.6	3.4	.8	3.7	4.3	.6	4.0	4.6	.6
	C	1.7	2.4	.7	2.5	3.3	.8	3.1	3.7	.6	4.0	4.5	.5
All Pairs	Mean Diff.	.14	.38	.15	.12	.25	.12	.12	.28	.15	.15	.38	.25
No. of times ME School higher		4	6	5	5	6	5	5	5	6	4	8	6
No. of times Control School higher		0	0	1	2	1	2	2	0	1	2	0	2
No. of times no difference		4	2	2	1	1	1	1	3	1	2	0	0

Comparisons Omitted at Lower Reading Levels

The test used to measure reading achievement in grades 5 and 6 has a minimum score or grade equivalent of 3.0. A careful evaluation would use a different test with a lower minimum score to retest all children who scored 3.0 in both control and M.E. Schools. This would determine the effect of M.E.S. on children at the bottom of the scale; however, this was not done.

It is important because there are too many children in upper grades of Special Service elementary schools who are non-readers or just a little better. In M.E.S., although we still have some children in these grades reading below 3.0 most of them can read and are very close to 3.0 level. Administration of a test with lower minimum scores would illustrate this fact convincingly.

Use of Longitudinal Studies

Two tables are provided which claim to be longitudinal studies of achievement in arithmetic and reading. (47, 60) They lack validity for two reasons:

1. They do not indicate comparisons with control or Special Service schools.

2. They are not longitudinal studies. A longitudinal study would measure the growth of exactly the same students over the period of time studied. In the seven comparisons made in the two tables, all have fewer subjects in the third test than in the first two -- in one case as many as 595 fewer. A scientific evaluation would have measured the longitudinal growth of the same students only. If any students were lost in the final years, results of the first two years should have changed to omit these students. These tables No. 8 and No. 14 can be found further on in this report.

Expected Change in Reading Scores During the Summer

1. In one table, the C.U.E. report indicates that the expected growth in reading scores between the test given in May and that given in October of the same year is a gain of 3 months. (86) This is a statement unsupported by any facts. An analysis of available statistics indicates that test results for 237 Special Service schools in Manhattan, Bronx, and Brooklyn for May and October of 1966 show that only 35% of those schools gained, and most of these gained only 1 month. The majority, 65%, either were unchanged (22%) or fell (43%). These statistics were readily available to the C.U.E. research staff at the Bureau of Educational Research. Why did they not use them to test their assumption of growth from May to October?

2. The table which C.U.E. used to supposedly illustrate the information discussed above follows, along with a more accurate analysis of its impact.

Table 12

Changes in Reading Level, Fall to Spring and Spring to Fall, MES, October 1964 to April 1967

Grades	Statistic	Year 1 Oct. '64	Year 1 May '65	Year 2 Oct. '65	Year 2 May '66	Year 3 Oct. '66	Year 3 April '67	All Three Years
2,3,4	Median	1.8	2.4	2.6	3.7	3.3	3.9	
	Fall to Spring Change	+.6		+1.1		+.6		
	Expected Change	+.7		+.7		+.6		
	Net Change	-.1		+.4		0		+.3
	Spring to Fall Change		+.2		-0.4			
	Expected Change		+.3		+.3			
	Net Change		-.1		-0.7			-.8
3,4,5	Median	2.6	3.4	3.4	4.2	3.8	4.5	
	Fall to Spring Change	+.8		+.8		+.7		
	Expected Change	+.7		+.7		+.6		
	Net Change	+.1		+.1		+.1		+.3
	Spring to Fall Change		0		-.4			
	Expected Change		+.3		+.3			
	Net Change		-.3		-.7			-1.0
4,5,6	Median	3.0	4.1	4.4	5.2	5.1	5.5	
	Fall to Spring Change	1.1		+.8		+.4		
	Expected Change	.7		+.7		+.6		
	Net Change	+.4		+.1		-.2		+.3
	Spring to Fall Change		+.3		-.1			
	Expected Change		+.3		+.3			
	Net Change		0		-.4			-.4

The actual fact which should be apparent from this table is that over a teaching span of 26 school months from October, 1964, to April, 1967, the following growth in reading was made.

Classes moving from grade 2 to 4 -- 21 months gain in reading
Classes moving from grade 3 to 5 -- 19 months gain in reading
Classes moving from grade 4 to 6 -- 25 months gain in reading

This proves that classes moving from grade 4 to grade 6 were only one school month away from the national norms. C.U.E. conclusions failed to reveal this truly remarkable growth. The other two comparisons are also favorable based on what we know about expected growth in Special Service schools, although not as good as progress in grades 4 - 6.

Retesting M.E.S. Children in June

A sample of M.E.S. children was retested at the end of June, 1967 to see if there had been a decline since April. C.U.E. project staff administered and scored the tests. The report states: "The presence of a stranger coming in to administer a reading test was not, in itself, a factor sufficient to distort the class average performance." (65)

1. To reply to this quote from the C.U.E. report, we refer again to Dr. Lennon: "These (disadvantaged) pupils need to feel that in giving tests, the teacher is deeply concerned about how well they do, that she wants to have them do their best, that she wants the test information only so that she can help them." (B) None of this applies to the false situation conducted in June. College students, many with no experience in testing and none known to the children entered classrooms in late June to administer tests when children were set toward vacation time.

   Some of the practices of the examiners that made the June tests invalid include:

   a) Trips were canceled to enable tests to be administered.

   b) Gym and other special and highly desirable classes were canceled to allow the tests to be administered.

   c) Timing was so poor that some tests ran into lunch hours and dismissal time.

   d) The "testers" could not maintain reasonable order and discipline.

   e) Some tests were administered late in the afternoon.

(B) Ibid.

2. It is also important to note that, as usual, the researcher failed to provide any comparative statistics for control or Special Service schools. The tests were not even administered in control schools.

   The inclusion of any reference to the June test must be considered as an example of unscientific and uninformed research.

CONCLUSIONS RELATED TO ACADEMIC GROWTH

We have analyzed the methods used to arrive at conclusions and have found them seriously lacking an essential scientific base. It is necessary, however, to go further and to scrutinize the actual conclusions reached by the C.U.E. report. It will become clear that even the incomplete and unscientifically drawn data provided do not lead to the negative conclusions made by C.U.E., but rather support the contention that children in M.E.S. are doing better.

Conclusions Related to Arithmetic Achievement

The C.U.E. report states: "Overall, one would conclude that the M.E.S. program has not had any significant or consistent effect on children's performance in arithmetic problem solving and concepts." (48)

1. In "normal" schools throughout the nation, children are expected to make one year's gain in a year. Normal growth for New York's Special Service schools is much less. It is known that children in Special Service schools increase their retardation every year. They are nearly 1 year retarded at the end of the third grade and almost 2 years behind by the end of the sixth grade. Both tables dealing with arithmetic achievement in M.E.S. show the children's improvement over this trend. Third year pupils are only 1 month behind and sixth year pupils are only one year behind.

Table 7

Grade Equivalents in Arithmetic Problem Solving and Concepts Test, Medians, Status in Relation to Norms and Range; by Grade and Type of School.

	Grade 2			3			4			5			6		
Statistic	Old	New	All	Old	New	All	Old	New	All	Old	New	All	Old	New	All
Mean	2.8	2.7	2.8	3.4	3.5	3.5	4.3	3.9	4.0	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.8	5.4	5.6
Norm	2.6	2.6	2.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	6.6	6.6	6.6
Status in Relation to Norm	+.2	+.1	+.2	-.2	-.1	-.1	-.3	-.7	-.6	-.8	-.8	-.8	-.8	-1.2	-1.0
Lowest School Median	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.8	2.8	2.8	3.5	3.5	3.5	4.4	4.2	4.2	5.0	5.1	5.0
Highest School Median	3.4	3.3	3.4	4.4	3.9	4.4	5.4	4.3	5.4	5.6	5.3	5.6	6.5	5.9	6.5
Overall Range by School	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.6	1.1	1.6	1.9	.8	1.9	1.2	1.1	1.4	1.5	.8	1.5

2. The so-called "longitudinal" study indicates that over a 26 school month testing period from grades 3 to 5, retardation increased only 2 months, and from grades 4 to 6 retardation actually decreased 4 months. The 2-year studies showed a decrease in retardation of 5 months from grade 4 to 5 and an arrest of any further retardation from grade 5 to 6. This indicates progress above national norms in grades 4-6 of old M.E.S. and grades 5-6 of new M.E.S., and only slightly below national norms in grades 3-5 of old M.E.S. Since children come into M.E. Schools severely retarded, making gains better than, equal to, or slightly below national norms while in M.E.S., represents great progress.

Table 8

Longitudinal Study in Arithmetic Achievement, Old and New MES

Grade	Date of Test	No. of Children	Median	Norm at Testing	Comparison with Norm	Net Change by May '66	Net Change During '66-'67	Net Change by Mar. '67
Old MES								
3	Oct. '64	628	2.6	3.1	-.5			
4	May '66	628	4.5	4.8	-.3	+.2	-.4	-.2
5	Mar. '67	531	4.9	5.6	-.7			
4	Oct. '64	656	3.0	4.1	-1.1			
5	May '66	656	5.1	5.8	-.7	+.4	0	+.4
6	Mar. '67	408[a]	5.9	6.6	-.7			
New MES								
4	Oct. '65	741	3.1	4.2	-1.1			
4	May '66	741	4.2	4.8	-.6	+.5	0	+.5
5	Mar. '67	383	5.0	5.6	-.6			
5	Oct. '65	694	4.0	5.2	-1.2			
5	May '66	694	4.5	5.8	-1.3	-.1	+.1	0
6	Mar. '67	102[a]	5.4	6.6	-1.2			

[a]The Attrition here reflects the fact that few ME schools have a sixth grade.

These figures prove the exact opposite of C.U.E.'s conclusions. When compared to Special Service school standards, M.E.S. did very much better.

Conclusions Related to Reading Achievement

1. The same analysis must be applied to the so-called "longitudinal" study of reading progress (60). The small increase in retardation over the 26 months measured in grades 2-4 and 3-5, and the maintenance of growth equivalent to national norms in grades 4-6 are proof of positive accomplishments of M.E.S.

Table 14

Longitudinal Analysis of Progress in Reading,
MES, October 1964 through April 1967,
Median Reading Grade

Grade	Number	Date of Test	Median Grade	Norm at Testing	Comparison with Norm	NET Change by 5/66	NET Change During '66-'67	NET Change by 4/67
2	784	Oct. '64	1.8	2.1	-.3			
3	784	May '66	3.7	3.8	-.1	+.2	-.6	-.4
4	744	Apr. '67	4.0	4.7	-.7			
3	759	Oct. '64	2.7	3.1	-.4			
4	759	May '66	4.2	4.8	-.6	-.2	-.3	-.5
5	697	Apr. '67	4.8	5.7	-.9			
4	567	Oct. '64	3.2	4.1	-.9			
5	567	May '66	5.2	5.8	-.6	+.3	-.3	0
6	395	Apr. '67	5.8	6.7	-.9			

2. The comparison of reading levels for children who had been in the More Effective Schools for 3 years with those who had been in only part of the time (67) is also extremely positive. The C.U.E. report concludes that although continuous education in M.E.S. made a difference, children in that group were still .6 of a year behind in grade 4, and .8 behind in grades 5 and 6.

As has been indicated before, these levels of retardation show great improvement over what can be expected in Special Service schools. The clear fact is that children with 3 full years in M.E.S. scored from 5 to 9 months better than children who had come into M.E.S. during the 3 years.

Table 16

Comparison of Reading Levels for Children with Different Educational Histories by Grade, Old ME Schools Only.

Current Grade	Gp.	Education	MES	Median	Q3	Q1	IQR	Norm
4	1	Unbroken	Full	4.1	4.9	3.4	1.5	
	2	Broken	Full	3.9	4.6	3.2	1.4	4.7
	3	Broken	Partial	3.6	4.3	3.1	1.2	
5	1	Unbroken	Full	4.9	6.0	4.1	1.9	
	2	Broken	Full	4.7	5.7	3.9	1.8	5.7
	3	Broken	Partial	4.4	5.4	3.7	1.7	
6	1	Unbroken	Full	5.9	8.7	4.8	3.9	
	2	Broken	Full	5.6	7.3	4.4	2.9	6.7
	3	Broken	Partial	5.0	7.0	4.0	3.0	

The preceding evidence must surely make every open-minded inquirer ask how C.U.E. or the Board of Education can so strongly back a report with so many of its procedures and conclusions open to absolute refutation.

Comparison of M.E.S. With Special Service Schools in Reading

The Bureau of Educational Research at the Board made available to the UFT the average reading scores for each school in the city on grades 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 for the Metropolitan Reading Achievement Tests given in September, 1966 and in April, 1967. In addition, they made available the number of students in each school who were tested. From these figures the UFT was able to compute the average reading score for each test for all Special Service school children and for all M.E.S. children. The technique used was the technique of the weighted average through which each school average is represented in proportion to the number of students in that school who were tested.

The results are attached. In evaluating them, we should keep in mind the following facts. The Special Service category includes many atypical schools. For instance, Public School 76 Queens, a Queens College experimental school, heavily supported by Federal funds is a Special Service school, and its scores are included in the overall Special Service average. Similarly, college demonstration schools are included as are many other Special Service schools where there are special projects. Also included are certain Special Service schools which enroll large numbers of middle class children -- for instance, Public School 7-8 Brooklyn, the paired schools in Brooklyn Heights, many of the schools on the West side of Manhattan, the paired schools in Queens, the schools on the lower East side that take children from the Amalgamated Housing Coop, etc. The scores for the children in Central Harlem, the central area of Bedford-Stuyvesant, and other similar areas are a good deal lower than the Special Service averages.

Technically, the old M.E. Schools were three years old at testing time. Actually, the first half-year was spent in organization and the preparation of facilities. The program in the old schools may therefore be said to have been 2-1/2 years old at testing time. The program in the new schools was two years old at testing time. Only the M.E.S. second grade, therefore, contains children who started in the M.E.S. program. Even there we did not have at testing time children who had gone through the M.E.S. pre-kindergarten. Nevertheless, in April of 1967, second grade M.E.S. children read on the average two months above the national norm. Third graders who, at the earliest entered the program in first grade read one month above the national norm. The upper three grades contained no child who started his schooling in an M.E. School. Retardation has not been completely overcome in these grades. But the results are still far better than in the Special Service schools. We may hypothesize that the normal child who starts in the M.E.S. pre-kindergarten will be reading at or above grade level in the sixth grade if the tendencies of the second and third grade continue.

We must also bear in mind that each grade contains a substantial number of children who transferred into an M.E. School district, having received their previous education in a Special Service school. Thus, not all of the children in any grade have received two or three years of ed-

ucation in an M.E. School which might have helped them to overcome the retardation they suffered in the Special Service schools. (The C.U.E. study indicated that the longer the child was in the M.E. Schools the better he did, and that children who had received all of their education in M.E.S. did the best.)

Of the 21 M.E. Schools, 18 were formerly Special Service schools, and three were non-Special Service schools in transitional areas. The 3 M.E. Schools, formerly non-Special Service schools, did much better than the 18 M.E. Schools which were formerly Special Service schools. We hypothesize that these three schools have kept a substantial middle class population. Statistical studies made indicate that the specific weight of these three schools does not materially affect the figures for the 21 schools. In most grades in most tests there is no effect at all. In two cases the average is increased by two months, and in the other cases by one month or by no months. It seems fair to include these three schools in the overall average because we do include in the Special Service schools the averages for schools with substantial middle class populations or where there are special projects.

AVERAGE READING SCORES OF PUPILS IN

NEW YORK CITY'S SPECIAL SERVICE AND M.E.S. SCHOOLS

GRADE	TYPE OF SCHOOL	TESTING -- MONTH & YEAR SEPTEMBER, 1966			TESTING -- MONTH & YEAR APRIL, 1967		
		No. Tested	Aver.	Norm	No. Tested	Aver.	Norm
2	Sp.Ser.	36,940	1.7	2.0	38,080	2.4	2.7
2	M.E.S.	2,696	1.9	2.0	2,643	2.9	2.7
3	Sp.Ser.	37,164	2.5	3.0	37,259	3.3	3.7
3	M.E.S.	2,265	2.7	3.0	2,311	3.8	3.7
4	Sp.Ser.	36,973	3.2	4.0	37,062	3.9	4.7
4	M.E.S.	2,352	3.5	4.0	2,374	4.3	4.7
5	Sp.Ser.	34,613	4.0	5.0	34,780	5.0	5.7
5	M.E.S.	2,163	4.2	5.0	2,125	5.4	5.7
6	Sp.Ser.	30,772	4.9	6.0	30,217	5.6	6.7
6	M.E.S.	965	5.5	6.0	948	6.6	6.7

*Eugene Blum, UFT Special Representative, drew up the table presented above. Mr. Blum holds an M.A. Degree from Columbia University in Mathematical Statistics.

One must observe on the basis of this study that if second grade children in Special Service schools were reading at 2.9 at a time when the national norm is 2.7, there would certainly be no problem. Indeed, New York City teachers would be national heroes. If a program had been introduced in all the Special Service schools which in the second or third year of its operation had resulted in an average reading grade for sixth year pupils of 6.6 at a time that the national norm is 6.7, we might not be national heroes, but we certainly would not be faced with social catastrophe.

TEACHING TECHNIQUES

The C.U.E. study is also highly critical of M.E.S. in the area of teaching techniques. The analysis of teaching techniques was accomplished by "professional educators" or social scientists visiting the More Effective Schools and the control schools to observe classes and conduct interviews. The lessons observed were rated on a form called the I.L.O.R. (Individual Lesson Observation Report). We are told that the basis for evaluative conclusions is a comparison with findings in control schools and in schools involved in the Free Choice Open Enrollment Program.

Qualifications of Observers

1. Twenty-two of the thirty-seven observers listed are on the faculty of the College of the City of New York. This cannot be considered a truly independent or representative panel of observers. Working together on the same faculty can cause inbreeding of ideas and a similar point of view, and may account for the high agreement reported on rating scales.

2. There is no evidence that any of the observers had any experience in elementary schools. The 1966 evaluation conducted by C.U.E. used observers who had "an extensive background of teaching at the elementary level." (C)

Observation of Lessons

1. This report states: "No attempt is made on the I.L.O.R. to describe for the observer what each of the rating scale points means in terms of actual classroom behavior." (15) Thus no guidelines are provided observers in rating such vague criteria as "level of creativity" or "depth of the lesson," and the instrument is consequently subject to considerable individual interpretation as to how the criteria apply. It is possible, then, for observers to give a lesson the same mark for entirely different, even opposing reasons. This lack of standardi-

(C) Evaluation of the More Effective Schools Program by Center for Urban Education, August 31, 1966, Page 2.

zation clearly weakens the precision of the I.L.O.R. as a research instrument.

2. The use of the I.L.O.R. led to the conclusion that there has been no radical restructuring of the methods of instruction. It is difficult to understand this conclusion since other data also based on the I.L.O.R. seem to disprove it. We are told:

   a) "The lessons in M.E.S. were above average both in quality and the amount of material covered." (69)

   b) "Typical M.E.S. lessons showed above average or exceptional organization and planning." (69)

   c) "Discipline and control achieved were good or excellent in M.E.S. lessons." (70)

   d) M.E.S. lessons related more to children's own experiences.

   e) Of the eleven aspects related to teacher functioning comparing M.E.S. and control schools, the M.E.S. were rated better in <u>every case</u>.

Any logical person must interpret these findings as evidence that there has been a radical improvement in the quality of teaching in More Effective Schools.

FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

We have dealt with two major areas of the report, academic achievement and teaching techniques. There are other sections which are also open to question. We will deal with those now to further prove how unreliable the C.U.E. study is.

<u>Inclusion of Data For Open Enrollment Schools</u>

It is difficult to understand why test data for open enrollment schools are included in the study. These are not a control group. The population is a very special one, and the children in open enrollment receiving schools are recognized generally as being highly motivated by parents. One might conclude, following the trend evident throughout the evaluation, that since M.E.S. were clearly better than control schools, other extraneous test data were included to lessen the impact of the M.E.S. superiority.

Children's Perception of Their Class

The evaluation concluded that the M.E.S. Program had not had "pronounced impact" (38) on children's perception of class and classmates. The term "pronounced impact" is, unfortunately, not defined. The facts, however, indicate that 15 out of 19 responses on the "My Class" instrument were clearly favorable to M.E.S. over the control schools, and that more children in M.E.S. had positive perceptions of their class than those in control schools had.

Children's Perception of Their Teacher

The unscientific bias of the C.U.E. report is clearly illustrated in the discussion of children's reactions to the statement: "Teachers expect you to work too hard." (43) The children in control schools overwhelmingly indicated this to be true in contrast to reactions of children in M.E.S. Most people would consider this response clearly favorable to M.E.S. The evaluation, however, judged this response to be favorable toward control schools, based on an article in The New York Times. This type of subjective reasoning does not belong in a carefully conducted study.

Methods of Instruction

The evaluation concluded that the methods of instruction have not improved, and "This is one clear clue to the lack of overt evidence of improved functioning by the children." (70) If the reader accepts previously stated evidence that the children in M.E.S. have definitely improved their functioning, the evaluation's conclusions again become suspect.

Teacher Attitude and Behavior

The evaluation draws no obvious comparisons in the analysis of teacher attitude and behavior in class. (78) The results are described in general terms and no conclusions are stated. An analysis of the result, however, clearly indicates that teachers in M.E.S. received a consistently more positive rating than those in control schools.

Using Small Class Size

The evaluation indicates that the observers felt that the M.E.S. teachers did not take advantage of the smaller class size in teaching. However, how one takes advantage of small class size is subject to differing educational philosophies and methods. We do not know how the observers made their conclusions. It is quite possible that small class size per se might result in better teaching. This is never considered in the evaluation.

General School Climate

In the comparison of the general school climate in M.E.S. and control schools, the conclusions drawn need emphasis.

1. M.E.S. classrooms and school buildings (81) were above average and often extremely attractive.

2. "In terms of climate, the observers were laudatory about the general climate and specific attitudes in M.E. Schools, and the ratings were consistently and dramatically more positive in this respect than in control schools." (81)

3. "In terms of their overall ratings, half of the observers would have felt enthusiastic or strongly positive about sending their child to an M.E. School, a feeling not one of the observers had about any control school.... All observers felt the instruction they had seen in the M.E. School was worth more than the average school day, whereas the instruction they had seen in the control school was not." (82)

Early Childhood Program

In the chapter dealing with the evaluation of early childhood grades, there is no comparison with control schools in any way. This makes it impossible to draw any comparative conclusions. The statistics offered, considered by themselves, do develop an extremely positive picture of early childhood education in M.E.S. C.U.E.'s observations are included below:

1. "...observers saw children functioning with above average interest and enthusiasm and above average participation and volunteering." (91)

2. "...observers rated as above average, the quality, depth and amount of material covered in the lesson, creativity and imagination, and the extent to which a foundation was established for future lessons." (96)

3. "(Observers)...obtained an even more positive picture of the school than the highly positive picture we have already reported for the observers who saw the middle grades." (97)

4. "About two-thirds (of the observers) reported enthusiasm or strong positive feelings about having a child of their own in the school." (99)

School-Community Relations

At a time when New York is experiencing mounting difficulties in developing and maintaining good relations between the school and the community, one conclusion of the evaluation stands out. "In the areas of overall school climate and staff attitude as sensed by observers, and as reported by administrative staff and teaching faculty, it is clear that in most of the schools in which the M.E.S. Program has been established, there was an atmosphere and climate characterized by enthusiasm, interest and hope.... Moreover, parents and community, too, have responded with interest and enthusiasm to the M.E.S. Program in their neighborhood schools. The creation of such positive feelings and climates in a school system which in recent years has evidenced considerable internal stress and school-community conflict is an important accomplishment."

No school will be able to educate its children if there is unrest and antagonism between parents and teachers. The fact that parents and teachers work well together in More Effective Schools so that education is not interrupted should be reason enough to continue and expand M.E.S.

CONCLUSIONS

The United Federation of Teachers, while supporting the continuation and expansion of M.E.S. and defending the program against unjust attacks, does not claim that M.E.S. is perfect. There is definitely need for improvement in many aspects of the More Effective Schools Program as it is presently functioning. There is obviously truth in the charge made a number of times in the evaluation that there was great variation from school to school on every criterion considered. We applaud the suggestion made that the next step in research related to M.E.S. is to "seek to identify what distinguished the schools in which the M.E.S. concept has been more effectively implemented from those in which it has been less effectively implemented." (120) One must wonder why the Board of Education has never attempted this type of evaluation. There is obviously need for its inception, and it should involve both teachers and parents.

We also concur with the charge that "only portions of the M.E.S. concept have been implemented." (123) The "Report of the Joint Planning Committee For More Effective Schools" of May, 1964 was unanimously adopted by the Board of Education. It was agreed that it was necessary to implement a comprehensive program because limited improvements are futile. It is clear that this worthy plan was never executed. Some aspects of the program were never introduced in any schools and others were introduced in only some of the schools.... M.E.S. is criticized because it has not solved all of the problems of children

in two or three years. No reasonable person could expect these schools to be functioning on a level equal to national norms in so short a time. It is even less likely when we realize that the original M.E.S. plan, aimed at attacking all of the problems of children, has never had a chance to function.

The public interest can be served, and faith in our educational leaders restored if the following steps are carried out.

1. The Board of Education should instruct the Bureau of Educational Research to complete and make public its own analysis of pupil achievement in M.E.S. as they have done in the past.

2. A new research group, agreeable to the Board and the Union should be given complete freedom in analyzing the current data and carrying on a research program during the next two years while the program remains intact.

3. In order to restore direction to the presently leaderless M.E.S. Program, and to prove its interest in true and sincere expermentation, the Board must immediately set up a Citywide More Effective Schools District along guidelines developed jointly by the United Federation of Teachers, Citywide M.E.S. Parents Association and representatives of M.E.S. supervisors. It should also supply the Citywide M.E.S. District with a complete staff, and charge that staff with the responsibility for implementing in all of the More Effective Schools the practices found to work in the best More Effective Schools.

opeiu:153
SS:mm
11/16/67